



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
2 NAVY ANNEX
WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

ELP
Docket No. 194-00
21 April 2000

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 19 April 2000. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

The Board found that you enlisted in the Navy on 15 July 1997 for four years as an AN (E-3). The record reflects that you served without incident until 1 June 1998 when you were taken to a naval medical center by your husband after you took an overdose of pills. The medical narrative summary stated that you reported having "moods" for the past month where people at work would set you off and you wanted to "lash out and attack" them. You stated this behavior occurred about three times a week, and you would throw or slam things and then storm off. You envisioned yourself hurting your co-workers by "striking them over the head with an object" or "pushing them down stairs." You claimed you took the pills because you wanted to "end it all" and your husband apparently had to take a carpet knife away from you so you would not slit your wrists. You also reported a similar episode in February 1998 while at sea when you gathered several prescriptions together and took them all at once. You were diagnosed with a personality disorder, not otherwise specified, with

borderline, antisocial and schizoid features. Administrative separation was recommended since there had been at least two instances of dangerous behavior marked by suicidal gestures.

On 8 June 1998 you were notified that your discharge was being considered by reason of convenience of the government due to the diagnosed personality disorder. You were advised of your procedural rights, declined to consult with counsel, and waived the right to have your case reviewed by the general court-martial convening authority. Thereafter, the discharge authority directed an honorable discharge by reason of personality disorder. You were so discharged on 20 June 1998 and assigned an RE-4 reenlistment code.

Regulations authorize the assignment of an RE-4 reenlistment code to individuals discharged by reason of personality disorder. The Board noted your contention that personal problems impaired your ability to serve. However, you do not elaborate what your personal problems were or provide any medical evidence that the personality disorder was erroneous or invalid. The Board notes the Navy views suicidal ideation or gestures as destructive behavior and an individuals who behave in this manner pose a potential risk for harm to themselves or others if retained. Since the record clearly indicates you posed such a risk, the Board concluded that the assigned reenlistment code was appropriate and no change is warranted. Accordingly, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

W. DEAN PFEIFFER
Executive Director